REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for consideration of the subject patent application. This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed December 16, 2004. Claims 21-32 were rejected. The claims have been amended to address the concerns raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1-20 were originally presented. Claims 1-20 were previously canceled and claims 21-32 were previously added. Claims 21-32 remain in the application. Claims 28, 31, and 32 have been amended. No claims have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 28-32 stand rejected under § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 28 has been amended to remove the phrase "maintenance organization" and replace it with "third-party diagnostician" which is used in the specification on page 11, line 3. Independent claims 31 and 32 have been amended to correct antecedent basis from the changes made to independent claim 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 28-32 (including independent claim 28) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson, US 6,148,346 (hereinafter "Hanson").

In order to most succinctly explain why the claims presented herein are allowable, Applicant will direct the following remarks primarily to the originally presented independent claim 28 with the understanding that once an independent claim is allowable, all claims depending therefrom are allowable.

The Hanson reference cited by the Examiner discloses the use of a dynamic device driver which enables a system administrator located within a local area network to use a host computer within the computer network to change the security permissions for a peripheral device such as a printer. For example, Hanson states: "A system administrator using a printer access

maintenance menu [to] limit or expand printer access by changing accessible user address or [to] add or remove users from an existing access list." (See Col. 6 Lines 25-30). The driver can also allow the system administrator to locally execute a diagnostic program and receive information pertaining to the printer's status. (See Col. 7 Lines 45-50, Col. 8 Lines 48-55). The dynamic device drivers disclosed in Hanson are useful only for a system administrator or similar persons to control peripherals within the local network.

In contrast, independent claim 28, as amended sets forth, in part:

> **sending access authorization from the computer located within the local area network to one or more third-party diagnosticians**, wherein the one or more third-party diagnosticians do not have access to the local area network without said access authorization; and (See Specification, Page 10, Lines 18-21)
>
> enabling access by the one or more third-party diagnosticians to the printing device within the local area network **to enable a maintenance technician to determine a condition of the printing device before making a service call**. (See Page 10, Lines 21-24; Page 2, Lines 13-24)

The Office Action states that FIG. 1 of Hanson shows sending access authorization from the computer located within the local area network (LAN) to a third-party diagnostician, wherein the third-party does not have access to the LAN. However, the Examiner has come to this conclusion through hindsight reconstruction after reviewing the present application. While FIG. 1 of Hanson shows a "Company A Local Net" and a "Company B Local Net" connected through firewall connections, this is not discussed in Hanson's specification. Hanson makes no mention of the firewalls in FIG. 1 with respect to communicating with printers in different networks, no mention of company A or company B, no mention of the PC 35, the Ether Talk 38, or the WWW Server Sun 40.

Firewalls generally block access between multiple networks and the Internet as in FIG. 1. The only mention of a firewall in Hanson is a discussion of allowing a network administrator to

set network options for a proxy server. The proxy server handles requests, caching, and/or data destined for machines located inside the firewall. (See Col. 6, Lines 53-62).

The only discussion in Hanson of communicating with a printer outside the LAN is a brief discussion of using a dynamic driver to enable an operating system to communicate with peripherals "connected on the Internet 22, such as printer 36." (See Col. 4, Lines 10-20, FIG. 1). Hanson is essentially silent as to what this means or how one might accomplish what the Examiner has said Hanson is able to do. Applicant interprets FIG. 1 of Hanson in correlation with Hanson's discussion to mean that each of the devices within Network A can modify the printer settings within Network A. FIG. 1 further illustrates that a printer 36 is accessible through the WWW (World Wide Web). What this means is that the printer has a web server inside the printer which can be accessed via a web port through a firewall. Thus, users can make changes to the printer settings using web pages. However, it is possible for the web access (port 8080) and all other access to network A to be blocked by the firewall. In this event, the present invention is valuable because a user inside the network can grant temporary access a printer technician.

In addition, Hanson's discussion is not enabling as compared to the present claims. Merely stating that a device driver can be used to communicate with peripherals on the internet does not enable one skilled in the art to do so.

Despite the fact that FIG. 1 shows two company LANS connected through firewalls, there is no mention in the specification of how the computers on the LAN can communicate with computers or peripherals on a separate LAN. Further, there is no discussion of how peripherals outside of a LAN may be protected from unwanted access.

The Examiner's determination that the present invention is anticipated by Hanson comes not from the disclosure of Hanson, but rather by a reading of the present invention onto FIG. 1 of Hanson. Hanson does not enable one skilled in the art to practice the present invention. Hanson does not disclose any method **for sending access authorization from the computer located within the LAN to one or more third-party diagnosticians not having access to the LAN** to enable the third-party diagnosticians to have access to the printing devices within the LAN.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claim 28 is allowable, and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection. The dependent claims, 29-32, being narrower in scope, are allowable for at least the reasons for which the independent claim is allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-27 (including independent claim 21) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hanson in view of Wood et al., US 6,453,127 (hereinafter "Wood").

The same arguments made previously for claim 28 apply to the rejection of independent claim 21. Claim 21 reads, in part:

> **a remote diagnostic center computer having a separate internet connection** and a remote diagnostic center website with a printing device management application located at the remote diagnostic center website, **wherein the remote diagnostic center computer does not have direct access to the local area network;...**
>
> the user interface further comprising **a share feature configured to allow a user within the local area network to enable one or more third-parties to view otherwise private information** regarding the printing device in order to enable a maintenance technician to determine a condition of the printing device before making a service call.

The Office Action states that Hanson teaches "a remote diagnostic center computer (PC 35, fig. 1..." having a separate internet connection and "another remote diagnostic center (e.g., 38, fig. 1)" with a printing device management application.... However, as previously stated, it is impossible for the Examiner to know how a computer in company A, as disclosed in Hanson, may be able to communicate with a peripheral in company B. The purpose of computer 35 or EtherTalk 38 cannot be known since Hanson does not disclose any information beyond the simple drawing in FIG. 1.

Hanson does not disclose a remote diagnostic computer having a separate Internet connection. Further, Hanson does not disclose a share feature configured to allow a user within a

LAN to enable one or more third-parties to view otherwise private information. Hanson simply does not disclose any information about a share feature. Hanson doesn't teach how a computer in company A may or may not access a peripheral in company B.

Therefore, Hanson does not teach or disclose enabling a third-party, such as a maintenance technician, which is located outside the local area network, to have access to the printing devices. In fact, Hanson discloses a driver which enables a system administrator to have access to the printers throughout the local area network. There would be no benefit for the system administrator in Hanson to have the ability to access the printer information using Java applets saved on a web server. The driver disclosed in Hanson already enables the system administrator to have the necessary access. No access to someone outside the system administrator's system is disclosed. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hanson and Wood et al. Combining the cited references would only provide a system in which the system administrator would have an additional method for changing security parameters for the printers within the user's own system.

In contrast, the present invention provides a system in which a third-party located outside the local area network can be authorized to access printing devices within a local area network. The combination of the cited references would not arrive at the present invention.

Therefore, the Hanson and Wood references, when combined, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 and dependent claims 22-27, which are narrower in scope, are therefore allowable, and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 21-32 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections and objections be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed and passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims remains after entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to call Steve Perry at (801) 566-6633 so that such matters may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

No claims were added. Therefore, no additional fee is due.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

DATED this 15th day of March, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. Perry

Steve M. Perry
Registration No.45,357

THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP
Customer No. 20,551
P.O. Box 1219
Sandy, Utah 84091-1219
Telephone: (801) 566-6633

H:\FILES\23000\23627\100016\09-1 Amd 12-16-04.doc